

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 13 are allowed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sourgen et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 2 recites a data storage apparatus comprising a scrambling circuit for converting an input signal to a desired format, and a storage device for storing converted data. The claim requires the scrambling circuit to be constituted by a rewritable device.

The Examiner did not point out specifically wherein the reference discloses the claimed scrambling device constituted by a rewritable device, and the claimed storage device for storing converted data. Instead, the Examiner relies upon claim 6 of Sourgen et al. for disclosing the claimed arrangement.

Claim 6 of the reference recites a numerical scrambling method for a programmable circuit, comprising the steps of:

(a) accepting a first set of data from a data bus, applying a first scrambling operation to said first set of data to produce a first set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a first rewritable memory;

(b) accepting a second set of data from said data bus, applying a second scrambling operation, which is different from said first scrambling operation, to said second set of data to produce a second set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a second rewritable memory, which is different from said first rewritable memory; and

(c) when a memory read request is accepted, reading one of said sets of scrambled data from a respective one of said rewritable memories, applying a respective inverse scrambling operation, corresponding to a respective one of said scrambling operations, to said respective set

of scrambled data to reproduce said respective set of data, and placing said set of data on said data bus.

The claim language does not expressly recite the scrambling device constituted by a rewritable device. Instead, the claim recites applying a first scrambling operation to a first set of data to produce a first set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a first rewritable memory; and applying a second scrambling operation, which is different from said first scrambling operation, to a second set of data to produce a second set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a second rewritable memory. Accordingly, the claim indicates that two sets of scrambled data are stored in a pair of rewritable memories.

As claim 6 of Sourgen et al. does not recite a scrambling circuit, it appears that the Examiner believes that the rewritable memories recited in the claim correspond to the claimed scrambling circuit constituted by a rewritable device of the present application.

However, claim 2 of the present application recites a scrambling circuit for converting an input signal to a desired format rather than a memory. In addition, claim 6 of Sourgen et al. does not disclose that the rewritable memories are scrambling circuits for converting an input signal to a desired format.

It is well settled that anticipation, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, requires that each element of a claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) *cert. denied*, 110 S.Ct. 154 (1989). The term “anticipation,” in the sense of 35 U.S.C. § 102, has acquired the accepted definition meaning “the disclosure in the prior art of a thing substantially

identical with the claimed invention.” *In re Schaumann*, 572 F.2d 312, 197 USPQ 5 (CCPA 1978).

As discussed above, claim 6 of Sourgen et al. does not expressly disclose the scrambling circuit constituted by a rewritable device, as claim 2 of the present application requires. Moreover, as demonstrated below, this circuit is not inherently disclosed in the reference.

Claim 6 of Sourgen et al. clearly indicates that the scrambling operations are performed before storing data in the rewritable memories. In particular, the reference recites a first scrambling operation to produce a first set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a first rewritable memory; and a second scrambling operation to produce a second set of scrambled data, which is then stored in a second rewritable memory.

Therefore, one skilled in the art would understand that the rewritable memories of Sourgen et al. are not scrambling circuits because they store sets of data, which are already scrambled.

Moreover, the specification of Sourgen et al. discloses scrambling by permutation of data bits using permutation circuits DBr2 and DBr3. However, the reference provides no reason to conclude that the permutation circuits are constituted by a rewritable device.

The specification of the reference further discloses that data supplied from the permutation circuits may be stored by rewritable memories. One skilled in the art would understand that this memories correspond to the first and second rewritable memories recited in claim 6 of Sourgen et al.

However, the data are supplied to the rewritable memories in a scrambled form (col. 3, lines 55-57). Therefore, the rewritable memories are not a scrambling circuit.

Accordingly, Sourgen et al. neither expressly nor inherently discloses the scrambling circuit constituted by a rewritable device, as claim 2 of the present application requires.

Accordingly, Sourgen et al. does not describe the invention recited in claim 2 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Further, claim 3, dependent from claim 2, recites that the scrambling circuit includes:

- a plurality of conversion circuits each converting said input signal according to different rules; and
- a selector for selecting one of signals output by said plurality of conversion circuits and supplying what is selected to said storage device.

The Examiner takes the position that the reference inherently discloses the claimed selector based on the Sourgen's teaching of "selection of the bits permutation different from a rewritable memory to another [sic]" (col. 4, lines 6-7).

However, the reference provides no reason for the Examiner's conclusion. To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probability or possibilities. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Sourgen et al. discloses that the data from the permutation circuit DBr2 are supplied only to the RAM, and the data from the permutation circuit DBr3 are supplied only to the EEPROM. No selector is provided for selecting one of signals output from these permutation circuits, and supplying what is selected to the storage device, as claim 3 recites.

Moreover, one skilled in the art would understand that the claimed selector is not inherently present in the Sourgen structure, because the reference indicates that "data are

differently scrambled according to the memory where it is memorized” (col. 4, lines 10-11).

Hence, the data scrambled by the permutation circuit DBr2 must be transferred only to the RAM, whereas the data scrambled by the permutation circuit DBr3 must be directed only to the EEPROM. Therefore, the selector at the outputs of the permutation circuits is not needed.

Hence, Sourgen et al. neither expressly nor inherently discloses the arrangement recited in claim 3.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Sourgen et al. is untenable and should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sourgen et al. in view of Kato et al. Claims 8-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sourgen et al. in view of Maeda. Claims 11-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sourgen et al. in view of Itoi.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 depend from claim 2 or 3. Therefore, they are defined over Sourgen et al. at least for the reasons presented above in connection with claims 2 and 3.

Moreover, the Examiner has failed to address the arguments raised in the previous Response. In particular, in the application of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to factually support a conclusion of obviousness. The Examiner must provide reasons why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to modify the prior art or to combine prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention. *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 227 USPQ 657 (Fed. Cir. 1985). *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967). These showings by the Examiner are an essential part of complying with the burden of

presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

However, the Examiner has failed to provide the requisite reasons for modifying Sourgen et al., and thus to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, the Examiner suggests modifying Sourgen to include address generator for generating address signals for storage location in response to external commands as taught by Maeda. The Examiner believes that such a modification “would simplify the specification of address and complicated control become needless.”

However, the object of the Sourgen’s invention is to improve protection of data in a program memory. The data are protected by mixing memory address data and instructions stored at that memory address. The reference teaches that the data are not arranged in the memory according to logical address, but are scattered around the memory (col. 1, lines 13-17).

Accordingly, the modification suggested by the Examiner would result in deterioration of the data protection in the Sourgen’s system. However, it is well settled that if a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Further, one skilled in the art would understand that there is no motivation to add the A/D converter of Kato into the Sourgen system because Sourgen does not use analog signals.

Moreover, one skilled in the art would find no reason to include the compression circuit of Itoi into the Sourgen’s system, as the Examiner suggests. The Sourgen reference discloses mixing scrambled and unscrambled data in order to improve data protection. One skilled in the art would understand that the compression of data suggested by the Examiner would make it

more difficult to mix scrambled and unscrambled data. Hence, this modification would render Sourgen's invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.


Accordingly, Applicants submit that the lack of any motivation for the proposed combination of references to arrive at the claimed invention undermines the basis for the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, and in summary, claims 1-13 are considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Alexander V. Yampolsky
Registration No. 36,324

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SAB:AVY:men
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: July 28, 2004